

A Re-examination of Quenches in ^4He

G. Karra and R. J. Rivers

Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London SW7 2BZ

(February 1, 2008)

In the light of recent difficulties in observing vortices in quenches of liquid ^4He to its superfluid state we re-examine the Zurek scenario for their production. We find that the standard prediction is suspect because of a confusion over correlation lengths.

PACS Numbers : 11.27.+d, 05.70.Fh, 11.10.Wx, 67.40.Vs

In thermal equilibrium the behaviour of simple systems experiencing a continuous phase transition is generic, as manifest in the utility of Landau-Ginzburg theory. Is this also true dynamically? The relevance of this question is that the early universe proceeded through a sequence of phase transitions whose consequences are directly observable, but whose detailed dynamics is unknown. Although it is difficult to measure an order parameter as it changes, many transitions generate topological charge or topological defects which can be detected. Motivated in part by Kibble's mechanism for the formation of cosmic strings in the early universe [1,2], Zurek suggested [3] that we measure the density of vortices produced during a pressure quench of liquid ^4He into its superfluid state, as well as the variance of superflow velocity.

The scenario, as proposed by Zurek, is very simple. It is exemplified by assuming that the dynamics of the transition can be derived from an explicitly time-dependent Landau-Ginzberg free energy of the form

$$F(t) = \int d^3x \left(\frac{-\hbar^2}{2m} |\nabla\phi|^2 + \alpha(t)|\phi|^2 + \frac{1}{4}\beta|\phi|^4 \right). \quad (1)$$

In (1) $\phi = (\phi_1 + i\phi_2)/\sqrt{2}$ is the complex order-parameter field, whose magnitude determines the superfluid density. We identify $\alpha(t)$ as an externally driven time-dependent chemical potential. In equilibrium at temperature T , in a mean field approximation $\alpha(T)$ takes the form $\alpha(T) = \alpha_0\epsilon(T_c)$, where $\epsilon = (T/T_c - 1)$ measures the critical temperature T_c relative to T . In a pressure quench at approximately constant T , T_c will vary with time t , and we assume that ϵ can be written as

$$\epsilon(t) = \epsilon_0 - \frac{t}{\tau_Q}\theta(t) \quad (2)$$

for $-\infty < t < \tau_Q(1 + \epsilon_0)$, after which $\epsilon(t) = -1$. $\epsilon_0 = (T/T_c^{\text{in}} - 1)$ measures the original critical temperature T_c^{in} against the temperature T at which the quench takes place, and τ_Q defines the quench rate. The quench begins at time $t = 0$ and the transition from the normal to the superfluid phase begins at time $t = \epsilon_0\tau_Q$.

With $\xi_0^2 = \hbar^2/2m\alpha_0$ and $\tau_0 = \hbar/\alpha_0$ setting the fundamental distance and time scales, the equilibrium correlation length $\xi(\Delta t)$ and the relaxation time $\tau(\Delta t)$ diverge at the relative time $\Delta t = t - \epsilon_0\tau_Q = 0$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(\Delta t) &= \xi_0 \left(\frac{\Delta t}{\tau_Q} \right)^{-1/2}, \\ \tau(\Delta t) &= \tau_0 \left(\frac{\Delta t}{\tau_Q} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

As we approach the transition, eventually the relaxation time will be so long that the system will not be able to keep up with the temperature change. We estimate the time t_Z (and the relative time $\Delta t_Z = t_Z - \epsilon_0\tau_Q$) at which the change from equilibrium to non-equilibrium behaviour occurs by identifying $\tau(\Delta t_Z)$ with $-\Delta t_Z$ *i.e.* $-\Delta t_Z = \sqrt{t_0\tau_Q}$. After this time it is assumed that the relaxation time is so long that the field correlation length $\xi_Z = \xi(\Delta t_Z) = \xi_0(\tau_Q/\tau_0)^{1/4}$ is more or less frozen in until the system is again changing slowly, at time $\Delta t \approx +\Delta t_Z$.

The correlation length of the field can only be measured indirectly. One of Zurek's proposals, as yet unfulfilled, is to measure the variance in the superflow in an annulus after a quench. Since superflow velocity is proportional to the gradient of the field phase θ , a random walk in phase would suggest that the measurable $(\Delta\theta)^2$ along a perimeter of length L has the form

$$(\Delta\theta)^2 = O\left(\frac{L}{\xi_{\text{var}}}\right), \quad (4)$$

where ξ_{var} measures the effective phase-winding length. If, as Zurek does, we assume that $\xi_{\text{var}} \approx \xi_Z$, then $(\Delta\theta)^2$ is large enough to be observed.

A more accessible experiment is to measure the density of vortices at their formation. If the *initial* density of vortices, the defects of ^4He , is n_{def} , with separation ξ_{def} , then

$$n_{\text{def}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\xi_{\text{def}}^2}\right). \quad (5)$$

Zurek makes the assumption that $\xi_{\text{def}} \approx \xi_Z$ whereby

$$n_{\text{def}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\xi_Z^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\xi_0^2} \sqrt{\frac{\tau_Q}{\tau_0}}\right). \quad (6)$$

Since ξ_0 also measures cold vortex thickness, $\tau_Q \gg \tau_0$ corresponds to a measurably large number of widely separated vortices. The details do not concern us here, but

one experiment [4] on ${}^4\text{He}$, for which $\tau_Q/\tau_0 = O(10^{10})$, shows fair agreement with (6), while a second experiment (as yet unpublished) with comparable τ_Q finds no vortices, within its accuracy. Because of this, it is timely to reexamine this picture, with its implicit assumption of a domain structure characterised by a single length.

In this brief note we shall argue that the predictions (6) and (4) are unreliable because we cannot identify ξ_{var} and ξ_{def} with ξ_Z , even though we may seem to have a single-scale theory. To see this we need an explicit model, although our conclusions are more general. Firstly, we accept that correlation lengths, by whatever definition, are frozen in during the time interval $-\Delta t_Z \leq \Delta t \leq 0$, and for some time thereafter. In the first instance it is then sufficient to perform all our calculations at $\Delta t = 0$.

At this time the *equal-time* correlation function is diagonal,

$$\langle \phi_a(\mathbf{r}) \phi_b(\mathbf{0}) \rangle = \delta_{ab} G(r). \quad (7)$$

Suppose that, as Zurek suggested,

$$G(r) \sim e^{-r/\xi_Z} \quad (8)$$

for r large compared to ξ_Z (but not necessarily asymptotically large). To go further we assume that, at this time, field fluctuations are approximately Gaussian. An immediate consequence is that the field phases are correlated as

$$\langle e^{i\theta(\mathbf{r})} e^{-i\theta(\mathbf{0})} \rangle \approx \frac{\pi}{4} f(r) \sim e^{-r/\xi_Z} \quad (9)$$

for large enough r that $f(r)$ is small, where $f(r) = G(r)/G(0)$ is the normalised correlation function, and $\phi_a(\mathbf{r}) = |\phi_a(\mathbf{r})| e^{i\theta(\mathbf{r})}$. Although this seems to support a simple domain picture, in which field phases are correlated on the same scale as fields, the relationship between the unobservable ξ_Z and the observable ξ_{def} and ξ_{var} is complicated.

To begin first with the defect density, the core of every vortex is a line zero of the complex field ϕ . The converse is not true since zeroes occur on all scales. However, it may be valid [5] to count vortices by counting line zeroes of an appropriately coarse-grained field, in which structure on a scale smaller than ξ_0 , the classical vortex size, is ignored. That is, we ignore vortices within vortices. This is, indeed, the basis of the numerous numerical simulations [6,7] of vortex networks built from Gaussian fluctuations. However, for it to be valid, the result must be insensitive to the details of the cutoff. Only then is the estimate reliable. For the moment, we put in a cutoff $l = O(\xi_0)$ by hand, as

$$G(r) = \int d^3k e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} G(k) e^{-k^2 l^2}, \quad (10)$$

enabling $f(r)$ to be defined. We stress that if the *long-distance* correlation length ξ_Z describes the asymptotic behaviour then it depends only on the position of the

nearest singularity of $G(k)$ in the complex k -plane, *independent* of l . Even if it only characterises intermediate lengths the dependence on l will be weak.

This is not the case for the line-zero density n_{zero} , depending on the *short-distance* behaviour of $G(r)$,

$$n_{zero} = \frac{1}{2\pi\xi_{zero}^2} = \frac{-1}{2\pi} f''(0), \quad (11)$$

the ratio of fourth to second moments of $G(k) e^{-k^2 l^2}$. ξ_{zero} measures the separation of line zeroes. Only if $\partial n_{zero}/\partial l$ is small at $l = \xi_0$ can we identify n_{zero} with a meaningful vortex density, and ξ_{zero} with ξ_{def} .

Finally, using the tools of Halperin [8] and Mazenko *et al.* [9] the final correlation length ξ_{var} can be shown to be given by

$$\frac{1}{\xi_{var}} = c \int_0^\infty dr \frac{f'(r)^2}{1 - f(r)^2}. \quad (12)$$

where $c = O(1)$. From (11) we see that the integrand of (12) is $O(\xi_{zero}^{-2})$ for small r , and falls off like $\exp(-2r/\xi_Z)$ for large enough r . If $\xi_{zero} = O(\xi_Z)$ then so is ξ_{var} , but otherwise it lies between the two.

Now that we have established the principle that the observable correlation lengths use different attributes of the power spectrum $G(k) e^{-k^2 l^2}$, we demonstrate it with a concrete example, motivated by Zurek's later numerical [11] simulations with the time-dependent Landau-Ginzburg equation.

That is, for $\Delta t \approx 0$ we assume a linear response

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma} \frac{\partial \phi_a}{\partial t} = -\frac{\delta F}{\delta \phi_a} + \eta_a, \quad (13)$$

where η_a is Gaussian noise. We go further and assume that, for early times, prior to the symmetry breaking at least, the self-interaction term can be neglected ($\beta = 0$). This both preserves Gaussian field fluctuations and leads to ξ_Z arising in a natural way, as we shall see. [A similar approach to relativistic quantum field theory [10] permits a comparison with Kibble's predictions]. All correlation lengths depend only on the renormalised $f(r)$, and the strength of the noise is immaterial. Writing the resultant equation in time and space units τ_0 and ξ_0 as

$$\dot{\phi}_a(\mathbf{k}, t) = -\left[k^2 + \left(\epsilon_0 - \frac{t}{\tau_Q} \theta(t) \right) \right] \phi_a(\mathbf{k}, t) + \tau_0 \eta_a(\mathbf{k}, t) \quad (14)$$

gives the solution, at $\Delta t = 0$, $\phi_a(\mathbf{k}) =$

$$= \tau_0 \int_{-\infty}^{\epsilon_0 \tau_Q} dt \exp \left[- \int_t^{\epsilon_0 \tau_Q} dt' \left[k^2 + \left(\epsilon_0 - \frac{t'}{\tau_Q} \theta(t') \right) \right] \right] \eta_a(\mathbf{k}). \quad (15)$$

The resulting un-normalised correlation function has power

$$G(k) = \int_{-\infty}^{\epsilon_0 \tau_Q} dt \exp \left[-2 \int_t^{\epsilon_0 \tau_Q} dt' \left[k^2 + \left(\epsilon_0 - \frac{t'}{\tau_Q} \theta(t') \right) \right] \right] \quad (16)$$

For a typical quench in ${}^4\text{He}$, $\epsilon_0 \sim 10^{-2} - 10^{-3}$ is very small, but $\tau_Q \sim 10^{10}$ is so large that $\epsilon_0 \tau_Q, \epsilon_0^2 \tau_Q \gg 1$. $G(k)$ can then be approximated as

$$G(k) = e^{\tau_Q k^4} \int_{\tau_Q k^2}^{\tau_Q(\epsilon_0 + k^2)} dt e^{-t^2/\tau_Q}. \quad (17)$$

independent of ϵ_0 .

On Fourier transforming $G(k)$ of (17) we find

$$G(r) \propto \int_0^\infty ds s e^{-4s^4} e^{-sr} \cos(sr) \quad (18)$$

This does not give an *asymptotic* fall-off of the form (8). In fact, for large r , $G(r) \propto \exp(-O((r/\xi_Z)^{4/3}))$. Nonetheless, numerically, it is remarkably well represented by (8), with coefficient unity in the exponent, for r being a few multiples of ξ_Z , for reasons that are not clear to us. In that sense Zurek's prediction for a correlation length of the form $\xi_Z = \xi_0(\tau_Q/\tau_0)^{1/4}$ is robust.

However, it is equally easy to determine the density of line zeroes at this time. In evaluating

$$\xi_{zero}^2 = \int_0^\infty dk k^2 e^{-k^2 l^2} G(k) / \int_0^\infty dk k^4 e^{-k^2 l^2} G(k) \quad (19)$$

we substitute for $G(k)$ from (16) and perform the k integration first. For small ϵ_0 , very large τ_Q , and $l = O(1)$, in dimensionless units the dominant contribution is from $t \approx \epsilon_0 \tau_Q$. On neglecting terms relatively $O(e^{-\epsilon_0^2 \tau_Q})$ we find

$$\xi_{zero}^2 \propto \int_0^\infty dt \frac{e^{-t^2/\tau_Q}}{[t + l^2/2]^{3/2}} / \int_0^\infty dt \frac{e^{-t^2/\tau_Q}}{[t + l^2/2]^{5/2}} \approx O(l^2), \quad (20)$$

independent of ϵ_0 . The details are immaterial. Firstly, since $\xi_{zero} \ll \xi_Z$ the frozen correlation length of the field does not set the scale at which line zeroes appear. If $\tau_0 = 10^{10}$ we have $O(10^5)$ line zeroes per correlation area. Equally importantly, we have a situation in which the density of line zeroes depends entirely on the scale at which we look. If we look at half the scale (i.e. half a vortex thickness) we see twice as many. It is incorrect to identify the length scale ξ_{zero} with ξ_{def} since such line zeroes cannot be understood as vortices.

This is not surprising. Although the field correlation length ξ_Z may have frozen in, the symmetry breaking has not been effected. The field magnitude has yet to grow to its equilibrium value

$$\langle |\phi|^2 \rangle = \beta/\alpha_0. \quad (21)$$

To see how this happens, we continue to use (13) for times $t > \epsilon_0 \tau_Q$. Then, as the unfreezing occurs, long wavelength modes with $k^2 < t/\tau_Q - \epsilon_0$ grow exponentially. Provided $\epsilon_0^2 \tau_Q \gg 1$ they soon begin to dominate the correlation functions. Let

$$G_n(\Delta t) = \int_0^\infty dk k^n G(k, \Delta t) \quad (22)$$

be the moments of $G(k, \Delta t)$, now of the form $G(k, \Delta t) =$

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\epsilon_0 \tau_Q + \Delta t} dt' \exp \left[-2 \int_{t'}^{\epsilon_0 \tau_Q + \Delta t} dt'' \left[k^2 + \left(\epsilon_0 - \frac{t''}{\tau_Q} \theta(t'') \right) \right] \right]. \quad (23)$$

We find that

$$G_n(\Delta t = p \Delta t_Z) \approx \frac{I_n}{2^{n+1/2}} e^{p^2} \int_0^\infty dt' \frac{e^{-(t' - p\sqrt{\tau_Q})^2/\tau_Q}}{[t' + l^2/2]^{n+1/2}}, \quad (24)$$

where we measure the time Δt in units of $\Delta t_Z = \sqrt{\tau_Q}$ from $t = \epsilon_0 \tau_Q$ and $I_n = \int_0^\infty dk k^{2n} e^{-k^2}$. If the linear equation (24) were valid for large p (i.e. large Δt) then the integral is dominated by the saddle-point at $t' = p\sqrt{\tau_Q}$, to give a separation of line zeroes $\xi_{zero}(\Delta t)$ of the form

$$\xi_{zero}^2(\Delta t = p \Delta t_Z) = \frac{G_1(p \Delta t_Z)}{G_2(p \Delta t_Z)} \approx \frac{4p}{3} \xi_Z^2, \quad (25)$$

independent of the cutoff l . That is, because of the transfer of power to long wavelengths, line zeroes become widely separated, and ξ_{zero} does begin to measure vortices, and can be identified with ξ_{def} . Thus, if the order parameter is large enough that it takes a long time (in units of Δt_Z) for the field to populate its ground states at (21) we would recover the Zurek result (6) as an order of magnitude result from (25), but for entirely different reasons.

Whether we have time enough depends on the self-coupling β , which determines when the linear approximation fails. For smaller times the integrand gets an increasingly large contribution from the ultraviolet cut-off dependent lower endpoint, and we recover (20). The multiple p_n of Δt , at which the exponential modes begin to dominate in the moments of G_n , can be determined by comparing the relative strengths of the contributions from the saddlepoint and the endpoint in (24). For the former to dominate the latter requires

$$\frac{e^{p_n^2}}{p_n^{n+1/2}} > \frac{(n-1/2)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{\tau_Q}}{l^2} \right)^{n-1/2}. \quad (26)$$

We see that it takes longer for the long wavelength modes to dominate the derivative G_2 than the order parameter G_1 . For $\tau_Q = O(10^{10})$ and $l \approx 1$, p_1 , satisfying $e^{p_1^2}/p_1^{3/2} > \tau_Q^{1/4}/\sqrt{2\pi}$, must be somewhat larger than 2.

Similarly p_2 , satisfying $e^{p_2^2}/p_2^{5/2} > 3\sqrt{2}\tau_Q^{3/4}/\sqrt{\pi}$ is larger still, somewhat greater than 4. We stress that these are lower bounds.

On the other hand, at an absolute maximum, the correlation function must stop its exponential growth at $\Delta t = \Delta t_{sp} = q\Delta t_Z$, for some multiple q , when $\langle |\phi|^2 \rangle$, proportional to G_1 , satisfies (21). Let us suppose that the effect of the backreaction that stops the growth initially freezes in any defects. This then is our prospective starting point for identifying and counting vortices. To determine q , or Δt_{sp} , we need to know the strength of the noise. In our dimensionless units we have

$$\langle \eta_a(\mathbf{k}, t) \eta_b(-\mathbf{k}', t') \rangle = \delta_{ab}(2k_B T)(\xi_0^3/\alpha_0) \delta(t - t') \delta^3(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'). \quad (27)$$

As a result, (21) is satisfied when

$$G_1(q\Delta t_Z) = \pi^2 \alpha_0^2 \xi_0^3 / \beta k_B T \approx 10^2, \quad (28)$$

for superfluid ^4He at $2K$. In order that G_1 is dominated by the exponentially growing modes, so as to recover Zurek's result in the form (25), we must have $q > p_1, p_2$ where, from (28)

$$\frac{e^{q^2}}{q^{3/2}} < 400\tau_Q^{1/4}, \quad (29)$$

say. In fact, although we need definite figures to make comparisons, a coefficient like that in (29) is not entirely believable, assuming as it does that the backreaction is effectively instantaneous. However, it is probably good enough to argue that, for $\tau_Q = O(10^{10})$, q lies between p_1 and p_2 . That is, field growth must stop before G_2 is either well defined, or able to give the result (6). We need an impossibly fast quench, with $\tau_Q = O(10^4 - 10^5)$, for q to be large enough.

What this means for the current ^4He experiments is unclear. Although line zeroes will be separated by more than a classical vortex thickness they will still show short-range structure and are only precursors of vortices. In fact, with G_1 insensitive to cutoff l , but G_2 sensitive, ξ_{zero} is arguably *more* sensitive to scale than in (19), where there was partial cancellation of l dependence between numerator and denominator. As for ξ_{var} the calculations are much murkier and we have not attempted to evaluate it. Much more detailed numerical modelling in *three* dimensions is needed before we can draw any quantitative conclusions. In less than three dimensions (particularly in one dimension [12]) the saddle point dominates more easily over the endpoint, which measures the strength of the ultraviolet singularities.

Even when our approximations are correct, it is not clear that the density of vortices at their first production is the relevant extrapolation for experiment. The interaction between field modes will tend to redistribute the power back to shorter wavelengths in the short-term, and the retarded nature of $G(r)$ after Δt_{sp} will impose

oscillations that may have consequences, as well as the possible incorporation of phonon modes.

However, we believe that we have presented a convincing case that, because line-zero density (and phase variance) are based on different attributes of the power $G(k)$ from the effective long-range correlation length ξ_Z , we should not make the inference (6) directly. Only if there is time enough before the field populates the ground states do we recover the Zurek result, although for different reasons. More details will be given elsewhere [13].

We thank Alasdair Gill for fruitful discussions. G.K. would like to thank the Greek State Scholarship Foundation (I.K.Y.) for financial support. This work is the result of a network supported by the European Science Foundation, an association of 62 major national funding agencies.

-
- [1] T.W.B. Kibble, *J. Phys.* **A9**, 1387 (1976).
 - [2] T.W.B. Kibble, in *Common Trends in Particle and Condensed Matter Physics*, *Physics Reports* **67**, 183 (1980).
 - [3] W.H. Zurek, *Nature* **317**, 505 (1985), *Acta Physica Polonica* **B24**, 1301 (1993).
See also W.H. Zurek, in *Cosmological Experiments in Condensed Matter Systems*, *Physics Reports* **276**, Number 4, November 1996
 - [4] P.C. Hendry, N.S. Lawson, R.A.M. Lee, P.V.E. McClintock and C.D.H. Williams, *Nature* **368**, 315 (1994), *ibid* *Formation and Interactions of Topological Defects*, (Proceedings of the NATO Advanced Study Institute on *Topological Defects*, Newton Institute, Cambridge 1994), eds A-C. Davis and R. Brandenberger, p.379 (Plenum Press, 1996).
 - [5] V.N. Popov *Functional integrals and collective excitations*, Cambridge University Press (1997), Chapter 8.
 - [6] T. Vachasparti and A. Vilenkin, *Phys. Rev.* **D30**, 2036 (1984).
 - [7] A. Vilenkin and R.J. Scherrer, *Phys. Rev.* **D5** 647 (1997), see also preprint hep-ph/9709498.
 - [8] B.I. Halperin, *Statistical Mechanics of Topological Defects*, published in *Physics of Defects*, proceedings of Les Houches, Session XXXV 1980 NATO ASI, editors Balian, Kléman and Poirier (North-Holland Press, 1981) p.816.
 - [9] F. Liu and G.F. Mazenko, *Phys. Rev* **B46**, 5963 (1992).
 - [10] G. Karra and R.J. Rivers, *Physics Letters* **B414**, 28 (1997)
 - [11] W.H. Zurek, *Nature* **382**, 297 (1996),
P. Laguna and W.H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2519 (1997)
A. Yates and W.H. Zurek, preprint (U. of Geneva) hep-ph/9801223.
 - [12] J. Dziarmaga, preprint (Institute of Physics, Jagiellonian University, Krakov) cond-mat/9802213.
 - [13] A. Gill, G. Karra and R.J. Rivers (in preparation).